

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. The office action that was mailed July 18, 2008 rejected all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. patent 5,966,714 to Huang et al., in view of U.S. patent 7,035,878 to Multer et al.

The claim rejections were made final. This amendment is therefore submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 with a Request for Continued Examination.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to traverse the claim rejections by amending them to require a *plurality* i.e., multiple, databases at both the network and the mobile node and that the multiple databases at the network and in the mobile node are different from each other. The amended independent claims also recite that the different databases are “asynchronously updateable” vis-à-vis each other. When one of the different databases at either the network or the mobile node is changed, the *other* copy is synchronized during an ensuing “synchronization session” using a change list, which is claimed as being a record of non-redundant changes that need to be made to any one of the databases that was changed since the previous synchronization session.

Dependent claim 2 has been amended to conform to the revisions made to claim 1.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. FIG. 1 clearly shows three (3) different databases in both the network part 16 and in the mobile node 12. Paragraphs [0034] and [0035] state that the first network database (identified by reference numeral 28 in the network part and by reference numeral 38 in the mobile node) is a LOTUS™ Notes database. The second network database (reference numeral 32 in the network part and by reference numeral 42 in the mobile node) is an EXCHANGE™-based database. The third network database (34 in the network; 44 in the mobile node) is an unspecified, “third-party database.” Since the databases are described in the specification as including a LOTUS™ notes database, an Exchange™ database and an unspecified third-party database, the Detailed Description necessarily requires the three databases to be *different* from each other.

Paragraph [0036] states that the three different databases are maintained in synchronization with each other. Subsequent paragraphs describe how the three databases 28, 32 and 34 are synchronized using *inter alia*, in the mobile node, the change listing, change list coordinator and the formatter.

The applicant contends that no reference or combination of references shows or suggests a methodology whereby multiple disparate databases are kept at both a network and in a mobile node and kept synchronized to each other by a single change listing-history of all changes made between synchronization sessions. The single change listing recited in the amended claims also precludes redundant changes being made to any one of the disparate databases during a synchronization session. The amendments to claims 1 and 15 therefore traverse the rejections and place the independent claims in condition for allowance. The claims that depend from claims 1 and 15 are therefore also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (214) 446-6684
Fax: (214) 446-6692
robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com